



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,333	06/09/2006	Alexander Kehrmann	KEHRMANN-4	5389
20151 7590 04/05/2010 HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC HENRY M FEIEREISEN 708 THIRD AVENUE SUITE 1501 NEW YORK, NY 10017				
EXAMINER				
ABU ALL, SHUANGYI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/05/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

INFO@FEIEREISENLLC.COM

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/596,333

**Applicant(s)**

KEHRMANN, ALEXANDER

**Examiner**

SHUANGYI ABU ALI

**Art Unit**

1793

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Status of Claims*

Claims 15-18 and 25 remain for examination.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 15-18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE10014468 to Kehrmann, in view of U. S. patent No. 4784691 to Rasmussen

Regarding claims 15-16 and 25, Kehrmann discloses a composition comprising  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and limestone, which is an mineral acid modifier as applicant set forth in claim 25 (Page 3, lines 1-14). But he is silent about the using of  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  as applicant set forth in the instant application.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention by applicant to use  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  in the cement composition, motivated by the fact that Rasmussen, also drawn to cement composition, disclose that  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  ( $n$  is in the range of 1-7, which is evidenced by the applicant submitted D4 translation), is used to reduce the content of the chromate in the cement composition and to obtain healthy working environment (col. 1, lines 41-47).

Regarding claim 17, kehrmann discloses that the amount of the  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is about 0.01-3% by weight of the cement and the limestone amount is in the range of 0.5-15% by weight of the  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$ .

Regarding claim 18, Kehrmann discloses that the amount of the  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is about 0.01-3% by weight of the cement. Rasmussen discloses the chromate reducer amount is in the range of 0.01-1%, therefore the amount of the  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  can be in the range of 0-0.99%. When the amount of the  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is both in the range of 0.5%, the ratio of  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  to  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is 1.

### **37 CFR 1.132**

The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed 01/13/2010 is insufficient to overcome the rejection of claims based upon the unexpected result as set forth in the last Office action because: The data provided are not commensurate in scope with claimed invention. The applicant argues that the unexpected result of the using the mixture of  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . The Examiner respectfully submits that the instant

application recites the reducer comprising not only  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  but also an acid regulator.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 01/13/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant mainly argues that the prior art fail to disclose that for the chromate reducer  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $n$  is in the range of 1-7. The Examiner respectfully submits that the IDS submitted by the applicant disclose that "Iron (II) sulfate occurs in various hydrate forms ( $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot n \text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,). Dependent on the content of hydration water, reference is made to heptahydrate  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7 \text{H}_2\text{O}$ , tetrahydrate  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 4 \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and monohydrate  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ . As a technical product pure phases (hydrates) usually are not obtained, but hydrate mixtures."

The applicant argues that the unexpected result of the using the mixture of  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . The Examiner respectfully submits that the instant application recites the reducer comprising not only  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{FeSO}_4 \cdot 7\text{H}_2\text{O}$  but also an acid regulator.

The applicant argue that the stability of the instant application. The Examiner respectfully submits that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the stability of the chromate reducer) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 01/13/2010 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHUANGYI ABU ALI whose telephone number is (571)272-6453. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.A. LORENZO/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

/Shuangyi Abu-Ali/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1793